

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No. <b>08/989,480</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Boncan et al.</b>
	Examiner <b>George Suchfield</b>	Group Art Unit <b>3672</b>

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) George Suchfield (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) William W. Enders (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Sep 15, 1999

Type:  Telephonic  Personal (copy is given to  applicant  applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:  Yes  No. If yes, brief description:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Agreement  was reached.  was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-35

Identification of prior art discussed:

Messenger'413

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant pointed out where basis was provided in the specification for the acronyms, e.g., BYOC. It was agreed that if applicant defined these terms in the claims, the 112 rejections would be obviated.

Applicant indicated that features from one or more of the objected-to dependent claims would be incorporated into the independent claims rejected over Messenger. Such amendment(s) should put the application in condition for allowance.

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1.  It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2.  Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No. <b>08/989,480</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Boncan et al.</b>
	Examiner <b>George Suchfield</b>	Group Art Unit <b>3672</b>

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) George Suchfield

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) William W. Enders

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Nov 3, 1999

Type:  Telephonic  Personal (copy is given to  applicant  applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:  Yes  No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement  was reached.  was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 33-35

Identification of prior art discussed:

Terry et al'383

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

It was pointed out by the examiner that the newly-cited reference to Terry et al could be applied against claims 33-35 under 35 USC 102 and/or 103. In this regard, it was noted that Terry et al, while including the recited cementing slurry components, such as calcined kaolinite or metakaolin, formulated their cementing slurry in the form of a drilling fluid and required an initial drilling step with such slurry.

Thus, in order to distinguish these claims from Terry et al, it was agreed to limit claim 33 to a method "consisting essentially of" the recited steps. Also, applicant may file an additional independent claim corresponding to original claim 33 but including a step of intially displacing the drilling fluid from the wellbore prior to cementing.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1.  It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2.  Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.